

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

- Claims 2-3, 13-15, and 22-23 are presently canceled without prejudice.
- Claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 20, 21, and 24 are amended.
- Claims 1, 4-12, 16-21, and 24-28 are pending.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed analysis presented in the Office Action.

Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted on April 4, 2006. An Interview Summary was issued by the Examiner on April 10, 2006, and agreement with respect to the claims was reached. Specifically, the Examiner noted that, subject to further consideration upon submission of a formal amendment, the proposed modification of claiming in combination a global screening section and an individual screening section, where the two sections are distinct from one another, appears to overcome the prior art of record. The claims are so modified, as discussed below, and hence Applicant believes that the Application is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 3, and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 2 and 3 are canceled and claim 5 is amended to obviate the rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by an article titled, “Abstracting Application-Level Web Security” by David Scott and Richard Sharp (hereinafter, “Scott”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of claims 2 and 3 (now canceled) and to clarify that two distinct screening sections are employed. Claim 1, as amended, is rewritten below:

1. A method, comprising:

receiving data input through a web page from a client device;

referencing a declarative module to determine a client input security screen to apply to the data input from the client device, wherein the declarative module comprises:

a global section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to any type of client input value; and

an individual values section that includes at least one client input security screen that applies to a particular type of client input value; and

applying multiple client input security screens to the data input from the client device, including at least one client input

security screen from the global section of the declarative module and at least one client input security screen from the individual values section of the declarative module, wherein the client input security screens are distinct from one another.

The two screens form the two sections are distinct from each other. As described in the specification with respect to Fig. 2, the client input security screening (CISS) unit 232 includes a global screen 234 and value screen 236. Beginning at page 8, line 5 (approximately, paragraph 33):

The CISS unit 232 includes a global screening portion 234 that is configured for all types of input values received from the client 208. Although not required, the global screening portion 234 of the CISS unit 232 may be pre-defined for all web.config files (i.e. all projects) in the server 200. Providing a pre-defined global screening portion 234 in the web.config file 202 ensures that page developers may not override certain system-wide security screening features. Additionally, a single web.config file may be provided for more than one project to serve as a global security screening function.

The CISS unit 232 also includes a values screening portion 236 that is configured to screen individual types of values that may be received from the client 208 (e.g., URL parameters, header values, form values, cookies). Although the global screening portion 234 may be configured to screen certain values from all types of client input, the values screening portion 236 may screen certain values from only one (or more than one, but not all) type of input value by including individual value screens, one for each particular type of input value. In other words, each such individual value screen only screens a single form of input, but multiple individual value screens may be included to cover all types of expected input.

Further, the specification describes with respect to Fig. 3 a two-stage screening process involving both global screening and individual values screening. The Office is directed to the discussion beginning on page 9, line 7.

Scott does not disclose these features. The Office agrees. As noted in the Interview Summary, "The examiner agreed that, at this moment of cursory review, these proposed changes appear to overcome the prior art."

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 1 and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-3 are canceled as being incorporated into claim 1.

Claims 4-11 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, define methods not disclosed by Scott.

Claim 12 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1. As modified, claim 12 is allowable over Scott, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 13-15 are canceled as being incorporated into claim 12.

Claims 16-20 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 12 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. Moreover, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 12, define systems not disclosed in Scott.

Claim 21 is amended in a manner similar to claim 1. As modified, claim 21 is allowable over Scott, and Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 22-23 are canceled as being incorporated into claim 21.

Claims 24-28 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 21 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 4-12, 16-21, and 24-28 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: May 15, 2006

By:



Lewis C Lee
Reg. No. 34,656
(509) 324-9256 x211